

District Three Implementation Committee Special Meeting Minutes August 25, 2008

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 5:36pm in Meeting Room A at Fresno City Hall.

The roll was called with the following members present:

Jim Tate Hill II
Crystal Jackson
Margie Reisz
Charles Dowling
Abraham Lopez
Elliott Balch

Members Absent:

Marlin Keeling

Others present: Mary Curry, Danny Lisenko, Gloria Ponce Rodriguez, Chuck Tobis, Leslie Kline, Keith Bergthold, Keith Kelley, Sophia Pagoulatos with the Planning and Development Department and Gregory A. Barfield, Staff to the Committee from the Office of Councilmember Sterling.

Review of Projects:

C-08-133 Southeast corner of South Elm and East Vine
Updates provided by Sophia Pagoulatos of the Planning and Development Department staff on the Environmental process which has been pushed back due to additional state review needed. It now appears that the initial Environmental Review Assessment will not be completed until October, with 30-days review. Further, a review of other sites is being conducted by Planning and Development Department.

Two comment cards were received from the site Open House, but any other comments will be forwarded directly to Planning and Development Department staff as it has a mailing address so more may be coming. Fire Department is looking into the number of HHW events in District 3 based on request by the committee. Just reviewed it this late afternoon and will be forwarding it to the committee.

Question on the process of acceptance/ refusal of items not on the HHW list and how this is handled. Top item is ammo which the Police Department is called to handle.

Some other items require the health department's review; the name and license number is taken down along with the description of the item as a safety measure to ensure the item, if illegally dumped, can be traced.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS (continued)

C-08-133

The Fire Department has only been called out to bi-annual HHW drop-off once due to an unstable chemical per Chief Tobis. He further stated that the Fire Department gets more calls from the City of Fresno Operation Clean-Up as most people don't realize that the item(s) must be disposed properly.

Question on what are the effects on human health in regards to the storage of larger amounts of household hazard waste in one location.

Request that more trash material be in Spanish.

There were questions about current operations at Sunset Waste.

Question confirming if the landlord (Sunset) enlarges, what happens with the CUP. The CUP runs with the property that in the future if Sunset no longer operated the site, another less responsible operator could take this on.

How many: 2 responded to an RFP with one stating they were interested but needed further time to study

The site selection was based on some 40 items. There are several items, where residents within 10 miles radius, to be already zoned appropriately with easy access on routes of travel secured with proper fencing.

What happens if Sunset were to be sold? Only government jurisdictions can run a HHW.

Who is the operator of the facility day to day? A contractor, Echo Solutions, who has built 20 others and runs 10 themselves are proposed to be the contractor. PSC, the current bi-annual contractor runs the others. Only the large metro area that does not have a facility. How often do they move? Very rarely.

Clarified that this is minor amendment to an existing CUP.

Time line for the County wide mobile network? Role out of mobile network after the Permanent site, in 6 months to a year.

Truck trips per day? Most material will stay on site (estimate) 90 days (law allows 1 year) except part which will be consolidated and reused and electronic waste which is far more bulky weekly. (see p.4 of operational statement)

Mrs. Curry presented concerns about the truck traffic and the condition of how items are received and transported.

Ms. Ponce Rodriguez presented concerns of environmental impacts on the general environmental concerns on small children and a grant application from EPA that could provide assistance in studying concerns.

Mr. Kelley asked who was the applicant and the role of the city or county. Unfortunately he hasn't been more informed on this subject but wanted to voice his concern.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS (continued)

C-08-133

Options before the committee are to vote on this item with all the material presented to date or deferring until additional environmental documents are presented.

Concern that no residents are a part of the process on the site selection/ host committee for this facility. Extend the number of other residential and potential commercial projects in the area.

Question about no project option in an environmental review.

Motion by Balch and **Second** by Lopez to postpone the project until the draft Environment assessment document is presented to the committee prior to the City of Fresno sending it to the State for review.

Passes.

An item was brought forth by the Planning Director for urgent consideration. The project is a County CUP 3245, Variance App 3890, Internal Study No. 6011 for 3115 South Fig Avenue.

Planning staff is requesting the environment impact on the project citing CEOA review through State cleaning house, and impact of 1 million gallons a day of water use. Request is to get additional information from the County.

Motion by Balch and **Second** by Reisz to have County staff provide additional information to the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department and to the District Three Planning Committee to review and allow appropriate time for respond.

Passes.

There being no further business, Motion by Jackson and Second by Dowling to adjourn the meeting at 7:35pm.